

Remarks

This is in response to the final Office Action mailed January 11, 2005 and the Advisory Action mailed March 8, 2005. Claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 15, and 16 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 7, and 13 are amended to incorporate subject matter from claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 15, and 16, respectively. Claims 11 and 12 are amended to depend from claim 9, and claims 6, 12, and 18 are amended to address typographical errors. Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11-14, and 17-20 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Preliminarily, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended by the Examiner to Applicants' representative, Robert A. Kalinsky, during the telephone call on May 17, 2005. During the call, the Examiner indicated that claim 1 would be allowable if subject matter from dependent claims 3 and 4 were incorporated into claim 1. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's assistance in identifying allowable subject matter. In view of this conversation, the amendments and remarks herein should place the application into condition for allowance.

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moudgill, U.S. Patent No. 6,578,094, in view of Nishikawa, U.S. Patent No. 6,346,822. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate subject matter from claims 3 and 4 that was indicated by the Examiner as being allowable. In addition, claim 7 is amended to incorporate allowable subject matter from claims 9 and 10, and claim 13 is amended to incorporate allowable subject matter from claims 15 and 16. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 7, and 13, as well as claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14, and 17-19 that depend respectively therefrom, are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 20 is rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moudgill and Nishikawa in view of Williams, U.S. Patent No. 6,519,702. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded.

Claim 20 depends from claim 13. Williams does not remedy the shortcomings of Moudgill and Nishikawa noted above. Therefore, claim 20 is allowable for at least the same reasons as those provided above with respect to claim 13. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The remarks set forth above provide certain arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claims. There may be other reasons that the pending claims are patentably distinct over the cited references, and the right to raise any such other reasons or arguments in the future is expressly reserved.

Favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: June 24, 2005

By: Robert A. Kalinsky
Name: Robert A. Kalinsky
Reg. No.: 50,471
RAK